

## City of Seattle

### ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

#### *Purpose of Checklist:*

The State Environmental Policy Action (SEPA), chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

#### *Instructions for Applicants:*

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can.

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write “do not know” or “does not apply.” Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later.

Some questions ask about permanent regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

#### *Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:*

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered “does not apply.” In addition, complete the Supplemental Sheet for Nonproject Actions (part D).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words “project”, “applicant,” and “property or site” should be read as “proposal,” “proposer,” and “affected geographic area,” respectively.

**A. BACKGROUND:**

**1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:**

2009 Comprehensive Plan Amendments

**2. Name of Applicant:**

City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development

**3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:**

700 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000  
PO Box 34019  
Seattle, Washington 98124-4019  
Contact: Mark Troxel (206) 615-1739

**4. Date checklist prepared:**

October 22, 2009

**5. Agency requesting checklist:**

City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development

**6. Proposed timing or schedule (include phasing if applicable):**

Public hearing: January or February 2010  
City Council Vote: February or March 2010

**7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansions, or further activities related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain:**

This proposal is for a non-project action with no directly related plans for future physical expansions or activities. In the future, the City will continue to engage in comprehensive and project-specific planning activities, many of which will address topics identified in the Comprehensive Plan.

**8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal:**

- The City prepared SEPA analyses prior to the adoption of the City's current Comprehensive Plan in 2004.
- Environmental analysis of proposed Future Land Use Map amendments inside the Downtown Urban Center and along the east side of Rainier Avenue is part of an Environmental Impact Statement for the Livable South Downtown Planning Study dated May 29, 2008, and available.
- Draft Environmental Impact Statement for a proposed Northgate Urban Center rezone dated May 1, 2008.

- Neighborhood Plan Updates for the North Rainier, North Beacon Hill, and MLK at Holly (Othello) will be subject to environmental review in December 2009.

**9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain:**

The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments are relevant to the entire city, within which are numerous applications pending for governmental approvals. Policy changes in the Comprehensive Plan will affect some future permit applications and City permit approvals, but there are no known projects directly related to the Comp Plan amendments now being recommended.

**10. List any governmental approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known:**

The proposed amendments will require adoption by the City Council . Some portions of the proposal may also lead to additional actions by the City Council.

**11. Give a brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site.**

The proposal consists of several amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, as summarized below.

**A. Amend the Rainier Beach Neighborhood Plan**

Adjust the boundary of the Rainier Beach Residential Urban Village to include an area south of S Henderson St between MLK Way S and the Chief Sealth Trail and amend policies in that plan to allow rezoning of a small area currently zoned Single-Family to a multifamily designation.

**B. North Beacon Hill Neighborhood Plan Update Placeholder**

Revise Neighborhood Planning Element goals and policies, and change Future Land Use Map to reflect new urban village boundary to reflect potential zoning issues and other revised neighborhood priorities. (This proposal will be analyzed in a separate SEPA document.)

**C. North Rainier Neighborhood Plan Update Placeholder**

Revise Neighborhood Planning Element goals and policies, and change Future Land Use Map to reflect new urban village boundary, potential zoning issues and other revised neighborhood priorities. (This proposal will be analyzed in a separate SEPA document.)

**D. MLK at Holly (Othello) Neighborhood Plan Update Placeholder**

Revise Neighborhood Planning Element goals and policies. (This proposal will be analyzed in a separate SEPA document.)

**E. Roosevelt Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and Neighborhood Plan Amendment**

Amend the FLUM in the Roosevelt Residential Urban Village in anticipation of a zoning proposal developed by Roosevelt Neighborhood Association and the Department of Planning and Development, consistent with the Roosevelt Neighborhood Plan.

**F. Shoreline Master Program**

Amend goals and policies as part of overall update to Shoreline Master Program.  
(This proposal will be subject to separate environmental analysis and separate Council action.)

**G. South Downtown FLUM Amendment**

Amend the Future Land Use Map to redesignate some areas in this neighborhood from Commercial/Mixed Use to Downtown.

**H. Northgate Neighborhood Plan Amendments**

Amend policies in the Northgate Neighborhood Plan to identify locations where future increases in development density would be appropriate and to address some of the issues associated with more dense development in the northern part of this urban center.

**I. Interbay BINMIC Amendment**

Amend the Future Land Use Map to remove land located north of Dravus in the Interbay area from the Ballard Interbay Manufacturing / Industrial Center (BINMIC).  
(The Executive is recommending this proposed amendment not be adopted.)

**J. Reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled**

Add a numeric goal for reducing the vehicle miles traveled in and through the city, and a policy favoring highway projects that produce little or no increase in vehicle miles traveled. (The Executive is recommending to defer this amendment to a future Comp Plan update.)

**K. Amend Use of Building 9 at Sandpoint**

Amend Sand Point policies to allow housing and limited commercial uses in Building 9 at former Sand Point Naval Station.

**L. Yesler Terrace Future Land Use Map Amendment**

Amend the Future Land Use Map to redesignate the Yesler Terrace site from Multifamily Residential to Commercial/Mixed Use.

**M. Affordable Housing Action Agenda**

Add policies that promote housing affordability.

**N. Cultural Overlay District Advisory Committee (CODAC)**

Add new policies to encourage establishment of cultural districts, and to define regulations and incentives that would implement goals of those districts.

**O. Greenwood FLUM and Neighborhood Plan Amendment**

Amend the Greenwood-Phinney Ridge Neighborhood Planning Element and the Future Land Use Map in the Greenwood/Phinney Ridge Residential Urban Village area to permit zoning proposals for an area near the existing Fred Meyer block.

**P. Industrial Land in Ballard Hub Urban Village**

Amend the FLUM for a portion of the industrial land in the Ballard Urban Village, consistent with zoning recommendations from the Department of Planning and Development.

12. **Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.**

The amendments would affect the City's Comprehensive Plan, which pertains to the entire City, although many of the amendments apply to specific neighborhoods.

**B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS:**

**1. Earth**

- a. **General description of the site: (circle one) Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other:**

The earth characteristics vary throughout the city from flat to steeply sloping. The proposed amendments should not increase the potential for earth impacts.

- b. **What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?**

The steepest slopes in the City exceed 40% and include the nearly vertical cuts of I-5 retained by concrete walls.

- c. **What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland.**

Soils conditions vary considerably throughout the City of Seattle and typically include a mix of glacial till.

- d. **Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.**

Not applicable. Specific project actions requiring soil analysis would require SEPA review at the time they are proposed.

- e. **Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.**

Specific project actions requiring filling or grading would require SEPA review at the time they are proposed.

- f. **Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.**

Specific project actions requiring clearing or construction would require SEPA review at the time they are proposed.

- g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?**

The city is already largely developed with buildings and roadway surfaces. Implementation of any of the proposed amendments would not significantly change existing conditions. Future projects will undergo SEPA review on a site-specific basis.

- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, other impacts to the earth, if any:**

None required.

## **2. Air**

- a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile, odors, industrial wood, smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.**

Implementation of the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments is not expected to result in significant long-term air emissions. Future actions authorized by any of these amendments will undergo project-level SEPA review, during which time air quality impacts would be assessed.

- b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.**

None applicable to this non-project action.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:**

No measures are proposed.

## **3. Water**

### **a. Surface**

- 1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.**

Many surface water bodies are located within the City limits.

- 2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach**

**available plans.**

The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments do not include specific construction projects. Any actions that require work adjacent to any surface water body may be required to undergo project-specific SEPA review.

- 3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.**

None expected. Any actions that require fill or dredge material may be required to undergo project-specific SEPA review.

- 4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.**

Not applicable to this non-project action. Future projects that require surface water withdrawals or diversions may be required to undergo site-specific SEPA review.

- 5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.**

Parts of the City are located within a 100-year floodplain, but the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments are not site-specific.

- 6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.**

Not applicable. The proposed amendments are not site-specific.

**b. Ground**

- 1) Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.**

Not applicable. The proposed amendments are not site-specific.

- 2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example, domestic sewage, industrial, containing the following chemicals... agricultural, etc). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.**

Not applicable. The proposed amendments are not site-specific.

**c. Water Runoff (including storm water)**

- 1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.**

Not applicable. Future projects will undergo SEPA review on a site-specific basis.

- 2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.**

Not as a result of this non-project action.

**d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water impacts, if any:**

None proposed.

**4. Plants**

**a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:**

- ☐ **deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other**
- ☐ **evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other**
- ☐ **shrubs**
- ☐ **grass**
- ☐ **pasture**
- ☐ **crop or grain**
- ☐ **wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bulrush, skunk cabbage, other**
- ☐ **water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other**
- ☐ **other types of vegetation**

Many of the types of plants listed above may be found in Seattle. The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments are not expected to result in increased impacts on plants.

**b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?**

No vegetation will be removed or altered as a result of this nonproject action.

**c. List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.**

Threatened or endangered species do exist in Seattle. The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments, as a non-project action, would not likely create new direct or immediate impacts on threatened or endangered species. See Section D of this checklist, however, for other commentary at a programmatic level on the indirect or long-term potential for impacts as a result of the implementation of the proposal. Future projects will undergo SEPA review on a site-specific basis.



- d. **Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:**

None proposed for this non-project action.

5. **Animals**

- a. **Circle any birds and animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:**

**birds:** hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:

**mammals:** deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:

**fish:** bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other:

There are a number of types of animals in Seattle. The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments, as a non-project action, would not likely create new impacts on animals. Future projects will undergo SEPA review on a site-specific basis.

- b. **List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.**

Threatened or endangered species do exist in Seattle, including Chinook salmon. The proposed Comp Plan amendments, as a non-project action, would not likely create new direct or immediate impacts on threatened or endangered species. See Section D of this checklist for other commentary at a programmatic level on the indirect or long-term potential for impacts as a result of the implementation of the proposal. Future projects will undergo SEPA review on a site-specific basis.

- c. **Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.**

Seattle includes migratory bird species and is located within the Pacific Flyway, one of the four principal north-south migration routes for birds in North America. The Pacific Flyway encompasses the entire Puget Sound Basin. The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments, as a non-project action, would not likely result in direct or immediate impacts on migratory birds. See Section D of this checklist, however, for commentary at a programmatic level on the indirect or long-term potential for impacts as a result of the implementation of the proposal.

- d. **Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:**

None proposed. Future projects will undergo site-specific SEPA review.

6. **Energy and Natural Resources**

- a. **What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.**

Not applicable.

- b. **Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.**

Not applicable.

- c. **What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:**

Not applicable.

## 7. **Environmental Health**

- a. **Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.**

Not applicable. Future projects will undergo SEPA review on a site-specific basis.

- 1) **Describe special emergency services that might be required.**

None required for this non-project action.

- 2) **Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:**

None proposed.

### b. **Noise**

- 1) **What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example, traffic, equipment, operation, other)?**

Not applicable to this non-project action. Future projects will undergo SEPA review on a site-specific basis.

- 2) **What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.**

Not applicable to this non-project action. Future projects will undergo SEPA review on a site-specific basis.

- 3) **Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:**

None proposed.

**8. Land and Shoreline Use**

**a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?**

There are various residential, commercial, industrial, institutional, and recreational uses located in Seattle.

**b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.**

Not applicable to this non-project action.

**c. Describe any structures on the site.**

Not applicable to this non-project action.

**d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?**

Not as a result of this non-project action.

**e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?**

Zoning designations vary widely from site to site within the City limits.

**f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?**

Citywide comprehensive plan designations are shown on the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) within the Land Use Element of Seattle's Comprehensive Plan (available online here:

[www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Seattle\\_s\\_Comprehensive\\_Plan/ComprehensivePlan](http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Seattle_s_Comprehensive_Plan/ComprehensivePlan)). Several of the proposed amendments would change the FLUM designation as follows:

A. Rainier Beach – Change the residential urban village boundary and change the FLUM designation of an area from Single Family Residential Area to Multifamily Residential Area.

E. Roosevelt – Change several areas near Roosevelt's Commercial Core from Single Family Residential Area to either Commercial/Mixed Use Area or Multifamily Residential Area.

G. South Downtown – Change two areas from Commercial/Mixed Use Area to Downtown.

I. Interbay BINMIC Boundary – Potentially change the BINMIC boundary to exclude land adjacent to the Burlington Northern property.

L. Yesler Terrace – Potentially change an area from Multifamily Residential Area to Commercial/Mixed Use Area.

O. Greenwood Town Center – Change the urban village boundary to include an area west of 3rd Ave. NW and an area north of NW 87th St. and change the designations of those areas from Single Family Residential Area to Multifamily Residential Area.

P. Ballard Industrial Lands – Change an area north of NW Market St. between 24th Ave. NW and 30th Ave. NW from Industrial to Commercial/Mixed Use.

- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?**

None of the areas where there are specific proposed Comp Plan amendments is within the shoreline.

- h. Has any part of the site been classified as an environmentally sensitive area? If so, specify.**

The City includes environmentally sensitive areas, including wetlands, shorelines, riparian corridors, landslide-prone areas, and fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, among others. The proposed amendments are not reasonably likely to affect environmentally sensitive areas in an adverse manner because changes do not pertain to these areas in particular, nor are indirect effects expected. Future projects will undergo SEPA review on a site-specific basis.

- i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?**

Not applicable to this non-project action.

- j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?**

Not applicable to this non-project action.

- k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:**

None proposed.

- l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:**

None proposed.

**9. Housing**

- a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.**

Not applicable to this non-project action.

- b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.**

Not applicable.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:**

None proposed.

**10. Aesthetics**

- a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?**

Not applicable to this non-project action.

- b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?**

Not applicable to this non-project action.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce aesthetic impacts, if any:**

None proposed.

**11. Light and Glare**

- a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?**

Not applicable to this non-project action.

- b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?**

Not applicable to this non-project action.

- c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?**

Not applicable to this non-project action.

- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:**

None proposed.

**12. Recreation**

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?**

Not applicable to this non-project action.

- b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.**

No.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:**

None proposed.

**13. Historic and Cultural Preservation**

- a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.**

Numerous such places and objects are found across the city.

- b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.**

This site-specific question is not applicable to this non-project action.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any:**

None proposed.

**14. Transportation**

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.**

Not applicable to this non-project action.

- b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?**

Not applicable to this non-project action.

- c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?**

Not applicable to this non-project action.

- d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe. (indicate whether public or private).**

Not applicable to this non-project action.

- e. Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.**

Not applicable to this non-project action.

- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.**

Not applicable to this non-project action.

**g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:**

None proposed.

**15. Public Services**

**a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.**

Not applicable to this non-project action.

**b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.**

Not applicable to this non-project action.

**16. Utilities**

**a. Circle utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.**

Not applicable to this non-project action.

**b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.**

Not applicable to this non-project action.

**C. SIGNATURE:**

I, the undersigned, state that to the best of my knowledge the above information is true and complete. It is understood that the lead agency may withdraw any declaration of non-significance that it might issue in reliance upon this checklist should there be any willful misrepresentation or willful lack of full disclosure on my part.

Signature:

---

Mark Troxel  
Urban Planner

Date Submitted: October 22, 2008

This checklist was reviewed by:

---

Senior Land Use Planner, City of Seattle  
Department of Planning and Development

October 23, 2009  
Date

**D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS**

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment.

When answering the questions, be aware of the extent of the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments (summarized at A.11) generally have minimal potential to generate direct or immediate significant adverse environmental impacts. The potential indirect or extended impacts related to changed future conditions associated with the proposals are discussed in response to the questions below, to the extent that impacts can be identified.

- ⇒ *A. Amend the Rainier Beach Neighborhood Plan.* Future changes to the zoning designation, and potential construction activity that may indirectly result from the new policy will be subject to environmental review.
- ⇒ *B. North Beacon Hill Neighborhood Plan Update Placeholder.* Neighborhood plan updates in North Beacon Hill, North Rainier, and MLK at Holly (Othello) will be subject to a separate environmental review.
- ⇒ *C. North Rainier Neighborhood Plan Update Placeholder.* See note at B. above.
- ⇒ *D. MLK at Holly (Othello) Neighborhood Plan Update Placeholder.* See note at B. above.



- ⇒ *E. Roosevelt Future Land Use Map and Neighborhood Plan Amendment.* Future changes to the zoning designation, and potential construction activity that may indirectly result from the new policy will be subject to environmental review.
- ⇒ *F. Shoreline Master Program.* The state-mandated Shoreline Master program update will be considered outside of the annual Comp Plan amendment process, and will be subject to environmental review.
- ⇒ *G. South Downtown FLUM Amendment.* The proposed amendments is addressed as part of an Environmental Impact Statement for the Livable South Downtown dated May 28, 2008, and available online at [www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/South\\_Downtown/Environmental\\_Impact\\_Statement](http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/South_Downtown/Environmental_Impact_Statement). Potential future construction activity that may indirectly result will be subject to environmental review.
- ⇒ *H. Northgate Neighborhood Plan Amendments.* Future changes to regulations or the zoning designation, and potential construction activity that may indirectly result from the new policy will be subject to environmental review.
- ⇒ *I. Interbay BINMIC Amendment.* Future changes to regulations or the zoning designation, and potential construction activity that may indirectly result from the amended BINMIC boundary will be subject to environmental review.
- ⇒ *J. Reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled.* The proposed goal will support ongoing and future programs and regulations to reduce vehicle miles traveled. Because those programs may or not be subject to environmental analysis, potential indirect impacts will be discussed in response to the questions below.
- ⇒ *K. Amend Use of Building 9 at Sandpoint.* Potential future construction activity that may indirectly result from the new policy will be subject to environmental review.
- ⇒ *L. Yesler Terrace Future Land Use Map Amendment.* Future changes to regulations or the zoning designation, and potential construction activity that may indirectly result from the new policy will be subject to environmental review.
- ⇒ *M. Affordable Housing Action Agenda.* The amended policies may influence the character of changes to development regulations or zoning designations. Those changes, when they occur, will be subject to environmental review.
- ⇒ *N. Cultural Overlay District Advisory Committee (CODAC).* The amended policies may influence programs and the character of changes to development regulations or zoning designations. Those changes, when they occur, will be subject to environmental review.
- ⇒ *O. Greenwood FLUM and Neighborhood Plan Amendments.* Future changes to the zoning designation, and potential construction activity that may indirectly result from the new policy will be subject to environmental review.
- ⇒ *P. Industrial Land in Ballard Hub Urban Village.* Future changes to the zoning designation, and potential construction activity that may indirectly result from the new policy will be subject to environmental review.

Although analysis of potential impacts that may result from these proposals and their associated legislative actions have been analyzed in some detail, further consideration of their potential impacts in the context of the Comprehensive Plan's influence on future actions is discussed in response to questions below to the extent that impacts can be identified.

1. **How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?**

### **Water Resources**

The proposed changes would result in no direct adverse impacts related to water resources. The proposals related to the FLUM and Neighborhood Plan amendments (proposals A through E, G, I, L, O and P above) and to the Affordable Housing Action Agenda (proposal M above), if they lead to an increase in the development of residential and nonresidential development within urban villages served by transit or an increase in the supply of affordable housing, could indirectly increase demand on the city's water resources and potentially increase discharges to water. The proposal related to Building 9 at Sand Point (proposal K), if it results in development of residential and limited nonresidential development, and the proposal related to establishing cultural overlay districts (proposal N), if it results in regulations or incentives that lead to an increase in development that includes cultural resources, could indirectly increase demand on the city's water resources and potentially increase discharges to water. Regulatory changes or individual projects that may result from the proposals, however, will be subject to more focused environmental review.

### **Air Quality**

The proposed changes would result in no direct impacts related to air quality. The proposed changes would result in no direct adverse impacts related to water resources. The proposals related to the FLUM and Neighborhood Plan amendments and to the Affordable Housing Action Agenda, if they lead to an increase in the development of residential and nonresidential development within urban villages served by transit or an increase in the supply of affordable housing, could indirectly lead to short-term impacts to air quality from increased construction activity. The proposal related to Building 9 at Sand Point, if it results in development of residential and limited nonresidential development, and the proposal related to establishing cultural overlay districts, if it results in regulations or incentives that lead to an increase in development that includes cultural resources, also could indirectly lead to short-term impacts to air quality from increased construction activity. Regulatory changes or individual projects that may result from the proposals, however, will be subject to more focused environmental review. Such construction projects would likely be subject to project-specific environmental review.

### **Noise**

The proposed changes are not likely to result in direct impacts related to noise. The proposals related to the FLUM and Neighborhood Plan amendments and to the Affordable Housing Action Agenda, if they lead to an increase in the development of residential and nonresidential development within urban villages served by transit or an increase in the supply of affordable housing, could indirectly result in short-term noise impacts associated with increased construction activity. The proposal related to Building 9 at Sand Point, if it results in development of residential and limited nonresidential development, and the proposal related to establishing cultural overlay districts, if it results in regulations or incentives that lead to an increase in development that includes cultural resources, also could indirectly result in short-term noise impacts

associated with increased construction activity. Individual projects that may result from the proposals, however, will be subject to more focused environmental review. Such construction projects would likely be subject to project-specific environmental review.

### **Production, Storage or Release of Toxic or Hazardous Substances**

The proposed changes would result in no direct impacts related to toxic or hazardous substances. The proposals related to the FLUM and Neighborhood Plan amendments and to the Affordable Housing Action Agenda could indirectly result in the production, storage or release of toxic or hazardous substances associated with increased construction activity. The proposal related to Building 9 at Sand Point, if it results in development of residential and limited nonresidential development, and the proposal related to establishing cultural overlay districts, if it indirectly leads to an increase in development that includes cultural resources, also could indirectly result in the production, storage or release of toxic or hazardous substances associated with increased construction activity. These potential adverse impacts will, if they occur, be subject to project-specific environmental review.

#### **Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:**

Additional project-specific environmental analyses and threshold determinations that may result in mitigation measures in the future.

## **2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish or marine life?**

### **Plants**

The proposed changes would result in no direct impacts related to plant life. The proposals related to the FLUM and Neighborhood Plan amendments and to the Affordable Housing Action Agenda could indirectly affect plants, animals, fish or marine life due to potentially increased construction activity. The proposal related to Building 9 at Sand Point, if it results in development of residential and limited nonresidential development, and the proposal related to establishing cultural overlay districts, if it indirectly leads to an increase in development that includes cultural resources, also could indirectly affect plants, animals, fish or marine life due to potentially increased construction activity. These potential adverse impacts will, if they occur, be subject to project-specific environmental review.

#### **Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:**

Additional project-specific environmental analyses and threshold determinations in the future that may result in mitigation measures.

## **3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?**

The proposed changes would result in no direct impacts related to energy or natural resources.

The proposals related to the FLUM and Neighborhood Plan amendments and to the Affordable Housing Action Agenda could indirectly lead to increased development

within urban centers and light rail station areas. Increased development activity in these areas would increase demands on energy and natural resources in both the short and long term. Directing new growth into existing urban centers and station areas, however, reduces the burden of anticipated growth on existing sources of energy and natural resources in comparison to growth that would occur outside of these areas. The proposal related to Building 9 at Sand Point and the proposal related to establishing cultural overlay districts also could indirectly increase demands on energy and natural resources in both the short and long term. These potential adverse impacts will, if they occur, be subject to project-specific environmental review.

**Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:**

No measures are proposed.

4. **How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened, or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?**

The proposed changes would result in no direct impacts on environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection. The proposals related to the FLUM and Neighborhood Plan amendments, the Affordable Housing Action Agenda, Building 9 at Sand Point, and the establishment of cultural overlay districts could indirectly lead to increased development that would affect environmentally sensitive areas and areas designated for government protection. Potential adverse impacts will, if they occur, be subject to more specific environmental analysis.

**Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts:**

Additional project-specific environmental analyses and threshold determinations in the future.

5. **How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land and shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?**

The proposed changes would be unlikely to allow or encourage land uses or shoreline uses that are incompatible with existing plans.

Proposed goals and policies related to the FLUM and Neighborhood Plan amendments, and the Affordable Housing Action Agenda could, if successful, indirectly affect land and shoreline uses by promoting greater density and increased infrastructure and amenities within urban centers and light rail station areas.

**Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are:**

For some future actions related to these proposed changes, City staff will analyze project-specific land use impact implications at a later date, and require mitigation measures for any identified significant adverse impacts.

**6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?**

**Transportation**

Most of the proposed changes would result in no direct increase in demand on transportation or public services and utilities. Proposals related to the FLUM and Neighborhood Plan amendments, and to the Affordable Housing Action Agenda will promote and enhance development within urban villages and light rail station areas. Increased development activity in these areas would increase demands on transportation. Directing new growth into existing urban centers and station areas, however, reduces its burden on the existing transportation network and promotes both more use of transit service and more efficient delivery of goods and services in comparison to growth outside of urban villages. The proposal to establish a goal for reducing vehicle miles traveled could indirectly result in increased demand on public transportation, and on right-of-way improvements associated with accommodating bicycles, pedestrians, among other alternative modes of transport. The proposal to allow housing and limited commercial uses in Building 9 at Sand Point could indirectly lead to increased demand on transportation, although the stated intention of the proposal is to provide housing for faculty and staff of the University of Washington and affiliated institutions such as Seattle Children's Hospital. Projects that may indirectly result from the proposals, however, would likely be subject to project-specific environmental review.

**Public Services and Utilities**

The proposals related to the FLUM and Neighborhood Plan amendments and to the Affordable Housing Action Agenda will promote and enhance development within urban villages and light rail station areas. Increased development activity within urban villages and light rail station areas will likely increase demand for public services and utilities, but are also potentially likely to promote more efficient delivery of public services and utilities in comparison to growth that might otherwise occur outside of urban villages.

**Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demands are:**

Additional project-specific environmental analyses and threshold determinations in the future for some of the actions listed above.

**7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.**

None of the proposals are known to result in conflicts with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for protection of the environment.

